

**MINUTES**

**P & Z COMMISSION HEARING  
June 19, 2003**

**ATTENDANCE  
P & Z Commissioners**

**ATTENDED**

1. John Dalton, Chairman
2. Frank Damato
3. Wendell DeCross
4. Tommy Joe
5. Claire Heywood
6. Drew Shumway

**ABSENT**

Roy Solomon  
Gary Nelson  
Jon Olson

**Staff Attendance**

1. David Ashton, Director of Development Services
2. Richard Young, Deputy Director of Public Works
3. Lance Payette, Deputy County Attorney
4. Mary Bradley, Secretary

Meeting held at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona - Time 6:30 p.m.

John Dalton called the meeting of the Navajo County Planning & Zoning Commission to order, and explained the meeting procedures to the public. Mr. Dalton then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item # 1 **ZONE CHANGE:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request for a **staff initiated Zone Change** from A-General to R1-10 (Residential – 10,000 square foot minimum lot size) on the subject property APN: 209-16-016 and 209-16-034 and confirm the existing zoning of R1-10 on APN 209-16-001B (Linden Trails) in T10N, R21E, Section 3 and 4 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Linden area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton said that this is a staff initiated request. Mr. Ashton showed on the map where two small parcels on the east side were not changed, while the rest of the big parcel was zoned R1-10. Mr. Ashton showed the commission a copy of the official mylars and said it was established in 1974 when zoning came into effect. Staff recommends approval. **Lance Payette** said that this was zoned R1-10 by the Board of Supervisors in 1976 for a similar subdivision. Mr. Payette said that all that they have is the Board of Supervisors Resolution and there was not a file on record that shows what their intent was at that time. Mr. Payette interprets the Board of Supervisors Resolution as saying if the subdivision is not developed within a certain amount of time then the zoning will lapse and revert back to A-General. Mr. Payette indicated that back in 1976 they were not recording these resolutions in the office of the County Recorder, and this was something that the Planning and Zoning would have on file. Mr. Payette said that since 1976 our staff had treated this as if the zoning had not lapsed and reverted back to A-General, and treated it as being zoned R1-10. Mr. Payette suggested that the developer could have an argument that the zoning never lapsed. Mr. Payette said that in 1989 the county updated the zoning maps and reconfirmed that this property was zoned R1-10 on the basis of that resolution (No. ZC-76-7). Mr. Payette said when the developer asked Development Services what the zoning was for that property and they were told R1-10. Mr. Payette said that if this is approved the property owners have a 30-day period in which they may circulate a referendum petition to take to the voters. Mr. Payette informed the commission that they need to make the decision if this is appropriate for R1-10 zoning, but not if this appropriate for this particular subdivision. **Jeff Vitale** is the developer. Mr. Vitale agreed with Mr. Payette's comments and said that he relied on the information provided to them from the county. Mr. Vitale explained that before buying the property he and his attorney came to the county and found out what they could and could not do with the property. Mr. Vitale explained that the property 209-16-034 was a narrow piece of property out front and they are not going to build on, it will be landscaped area only. On 209-

16-016 there was a home on this property, which they purchased in order to place another road for the subdivision. Mr. Vitale said that half of this will be used for landscaping and the other half will be used with junction 001B as a lot for a home. Mr. Vitale said that this parcel were advertised as 80 acres with the zoning as R1-10 on the sign when he purchased the property. Mr. Vitale said that their intent is to follow the county codes and do what the county told them the property was zoned for. Mr. Vitale said that they would improve the area and they have good CC&R's restrictions. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Sandra Roach** spoke in opposition to this project and indicated that she is the Treasurer of the Linden Community Association. Ms. Roach presented the commission with a petition of 113 people who are in opposition to this request. Ms. referred to the Board of Supervisors Resolution (No. ZC-76-7) citing section 4 which states "The permit hereby allowed is conditional upon the privileges being utilized within six months after the effective date thereof, and if they are not in accordance with conditions imposed by the Board of Supervisors, this authorization shall become void, and any privilege, permit or variance granted shall be deemed to have elapsed". Ms. Roach indicated that since no work was done in the six months, the Planning & Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors should have reverted the property back to A-General. Ms. Roach also cited ARS§11-832. **Carole Moore** spoke in opposition and said that she is the Secretary of the Linden Community Association. Ms. Moore refers to ARS § 11-829. D. "...After holding a hearing the board may adopt the amendment, but if twenty per cent of the owners of property by area and number within the zoning area protest to the proposed change, the change shall not be made except by a three-fourths vote of all the members of the board." Ms. Moore indicated that 21 percent of the area owned by persons and 86 percent of the number of owners within 300 feet of the subject properties protesting the change in zoning from A-General to R1-10. Ms. Moore said that the summary attached verifies the 21 percent (The commission were given a copy of the summary). Ms. Moore said that the Board of Supervisors are required to approve the changes in zoning by a three-fourth vote of all members if the Planning and Zoning Commission confirms the R1-10 of the large parcel and approves the change of the two smaller parcels to R1-10. **Lance Payette** said the 20 percent requirement that Ms. Moore was referring to require a ¾ vote from the Board of Supervisors and has no effect on the Planning & Zoning Commission. **Edwin Roach** spoke in opposition and said that he is a state certified residential appraiser and also the Vice President of the Linden Community Association. Mr. Roach indicated that this is a nonconforming use and these types of uses generally lower property values and affect the marketability of surrounding properties within a two-mile radius. Mr. Roach stated that properties located within 300 feet around the perimeter of The Linden Trails Subdivision average 2.34 acres (the commission received a copy of this spreadsheet). Mr. Roach also said that lots in the Linden Trails are much smaller and cited the measurements. **William Fautot** spoke in opposition and said that he is the president of the Linden Community Association. Mr. Fautot referred to a letter that Lance Payette sent to Edwin Roach dated June 4, 2003 and referred to page 4, paragraph 2(a copy of this letter was mailed to the commission). Mr. Fautot cites The Code of Ethics for Engineers of the National Society of Professional Engineers in II.4.a. Mr. Fautot refers to the letter from the Northern Regional Office of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality to Jenny Vitale regarding the Linden Trails Subdivision dated May 16, 2003. In the letter they reference the Arizona Administrative code R18-5-408(B). Mr. Fautot said that Jenny Vitale submitted a report that was not signed and sealed by a professional registrant. **John Dalton** interjected and said that this does not have anything to do with the zone change but it dealing with the subdivision regulations. **William Fautot** asked the commission for a cease and desist order for the developer until they furnished a certificate from ADEQ permitting Mustang Development to proceed with the project. **Dave Ashton** stated that he just got through speaking with the ADEQ engineer (Kurt Harris) late this afternoon. Mr. Harris indicated that Jenny Vitale had provided them with most of their answers. Ms. Vitale has already hired a professional hydrologist. Mr. Ashton said that this has nothing to do with the zone change. Mr. Ashton addressed the statement about the privilege being utilized. Mr. Ashton commented on how they deal with developers for months and months with phone calls as they get established and start their design. Mr. Ashton said that alone might mean that they extended their privileges and met the 6-month deadline, since they dealt with staff. **Wendell DeCross** said that a lot of information about these parcels being 2.5 acres parcels. Mr. DeCross said that 77 percent of these are less than 2 acres, 36 percent are less than 1 acre. Mr. DeCross said that he had a hard time believing that these are 2-acre parcels (Mr. DeCross information was from Mr. Roach handouts). Mr. DeCross said that the majority of these parcels are less than 2 ½ acres. Mr. DeCross also said that when the applicant purchased the property the advertising on the sign was R1-10. **Frank Damato** asked the developer if the smallest parcel is going to be at least a ½ of an acre. **Jeff Vitale** said yes. **Frank Damato** said that the developer could of have put four percs. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to stay with the R1-10 zoning. **Drew Shumway** seconded the motion. **Frank Damato** amended the motion to include all three parcels. **Drew Shumway** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #2 **ZONE CHANGE** – Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Curtis Fernau** for a zone Change from A-General to Commercial-Residential on the entirety of APN 209-20-015H and an approximate 36' portion of APN

209-20-015J (for a total depth of 300') in T10N, R21E, Section 4 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Linden area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton explained that parcel 15H and a portion of 15J are about 300' feet from the right-of-way. Mr. Ashton said that this was the standard for commercial areas along State Highway 260. Mr. Ashton stated that the Flood Control and the Public Works Department did review this and they did not have any comments. Staff recommends approval with stipulations. Mr. Ashton suggested an additional stipulation showing where the 50' roadway utility easement would be by docket and page. **Paul Barry** stated that he is representing Curtis Fernau and that he has no comments at this time, and is available for answering questions. **No one came forward to speak in favor or opposition of this project.** **Wendell DeCross** asked if it was typical to do 300' from the right-away edge or the centerline. Mr. DeCross said that he had no doubt that in the future that this would be five-lanes. A motion was made by **Wendell DeCross** to approve the zone change with the stipulation stated by staff. ***RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS: 1. Clarification of the Chamberlain Way easement/right-of-way is put on the survey map prior to presentation before the Board of supervisors.*** **Frank Damato** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #3 **AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Phillip Hoppes** for an Amendment to a Special Use Permit to allow for the expansion of a contemporary glass art studio on the subject property, APN: 206-44-004D in T12N, R17E, Section 27 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Overgaard area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton indicated that about a year and a half ago staff approved this. Mr. Ashton indicated that he had not received any letters or comments in favor or opposition. Mr. Ashton spoke about the applicant's work and what the applicant intentions are (placing a little studio on a concrete pad that will attach from his existing garage and studio). The applicant provided our Department with 6 letters in favor of this project. Staff recommends approval with stipulations. **Phillip Hoppes** is the applicant and he was in attendance. Mr. Hoppes explained how he lost his job and now resides full time in Overgaard and how he wants to pursue his glass business full time. Mr. Hoppes reminded the commission that he does not do any retail business at his home and how galleries showcase his work. **No one came forward to speak in favor or opposition of this project.** A motion was made by **Drew Shumway** to approve the Amendment to the Special Use Permit with the stipulations stated by staff. ***RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS: 1. Any expansion of the Special Use shall require an amendment to the Permit. 2. This Special Use Permit shall be valid for the current property owner only. 3. No activities in conjunction with this Special Use Permit shall be conducted outside of the garage/studio. 4. There shall be no employees reporting to the residence. 5. The Permittee shall submit, in writing, a statement verifying compliance with all stipulations. This statement will be due on each anniversary date of approval by the Board of Supervisors. 6. Hours of operation shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. daily. 7. Prior to being heard by the Board of Supervisors, a Final Inspection shall be conducted and approved by the Building Safety Department on the existing garage.*** **Wendell DeCross** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #4 **AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Stephen Durand** and **Erle Holm** for an Amendment to a Special Use Permit for the past expansions of an existing Recreational Vehicle Park on the subject property, APN: 212-03-112B and C in T9N, R22E Section 4 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Show Low area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton commented on how the original R.V. Park was supposed to be 35 units and now it is 140 units. The stated reason for this request is to bring the property into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance by addressing past expansions of the Recreational Vehicle Park made by the original owner without an Amendment to the original Special Use Permit. Public Works hydrologist Tom Hieb indicates that the R.V. Resort does not provide the drainage and flood protection facilities that would be required for a new development. Mr. Hieb recommends approval of the site plan; provided that there is no additional expansion of the facilities. Mr. Ashton read the stipulation by the Deputy Director of Public Works, Richard Young. Mr. Ashton commented on some of the residence concerns, which are dust, odors, inadequate water pressure and inadequate electrical power, seeping of the leach lines and overflowing septic systems. Mr. Ashton said that they did not have any code enforcement complaints on the property and staff recommends approval with stipulations. **Steve Duran** is the applicant and he was in attendance as well as **Erle Holm**. Mr. Duran gave of history of the property in reference to the previous owners. Mr. Duran explained that after he purchased the R.V. Resort he made plans to expand the park by 11 spaces and hired an engineering firm to check the permits and to do the necessary paperwork. Mr. Duran went on to say how he received a letter from Paul Ferris (previous Planning & Zoning Administrator for Navajo County) explaining that the Special Use Permit was for 35 spaces not the 149 spaces and how the R.V. Park was not in compliance. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Gerald Riggins** presented the commission a letter written in June of 1999 referring to the odors from the septic tanks. Mr. Riggins is

requesting that no further septic tanks be built here. Mr. Riggins went on to say if they are allowed to do more septic he would ask that the applicant would be required to go on a city sewer system. **Steve Duran** said that he would not be putting any more spaces in the R.V. Park. Mr. Duran said he would like this to be grandfathered in. **Bill Lamphere** is the president of the Residents Advisory Committee and says he acts as a liaison between the residences and management. Mr. Lamphere said that they have poor utilities but they are surviving with it. Mr. Lamphere stated that the residences are not against them issuing the Special Use Permit. **Lance Payette** said that we took this action in 1977 and did not record the Special Use Permit and the Title Recorder did not pick it up since it wasn't recorded. Mr. Payette said that the applicant had no knowledge of this restriction that is on there and we are negligent of not monitoring the Special Use Permit and monitoring the development. Mr. Payette said 26 years later when Mr. Duran purchased the property we are going to hold Mr. Duran to all sorts requirements as though the applicant was trying to put this in brand new. Mr. Payette said that the property owners as a whole should bear the cost of the road improvements. Mr. Payette said legally they could only ask the applicant to contribute his proportionate share. **Ron Matkin** said that he found some documents of certificate of approval to construct, and service agreements for the additional 44 spaces. Mr. Matkin said the first approval to construct was in 1979 and how could they construct without county approval? Mr. Matkin addressed some of the engineering requests, mainly asking the developer to toss in 2600 feet of road for his development. Mr. Matkin felt that this was unfair and suggested they should look at an improvement district. Mr. Matkin said that he talked to the owner of the water company and they do have fire flow on the outside and on their water line on the perimeter. **John Dalton** said that after reviewing the stipulations he felt that they should leave the roads alone. Mr. Dalton suggested that they should keep stipulations 7 through 11. Mr. Dalton said that it would be wise to form an improvement district and he felt that the applicant shouldn't be forced to pay to widen the roads. **Frank Damato** was dismayed how it got to two owners with out being caught. Mr. Damato said that the safety issues needs to be addressed and referred to the letter from Bill Lamphere (inadequate water pressure, inadequate electrical and leach lines). Mr. Damato went on to say that this is a health and safety hazard. **Wendell DeCross** asked about the letter addressed to Andy Brook from the Navajo County Health Department dated 1999. **Gerald Riggins** said that Mr. Brooks got back to him in reference to the odors and advised him if he had any future problems to please contact the Health Department. Mr. Riggins said that the parks are over populated and that the odor problems are due to the age of the septic tanks, and is not the owner's fault. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to approve the Amendment to the Special Use Permit with stipulations 7 through 11, and dropping 1 through 6. **RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:** *7. No fire hydrants are shown on the Site Plan. The Developer should obtain a letter from the Fire Chief or Fire Marshal approving the number and location of the hydrants and the available fire flows. 8. Submit plans to Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for approval of the water and septic systems used on site to support the RV Park. Once approval is granted, then the SUP expansion shall be scheduled before the Board of Supervisors. 9. Proper water pressure shall be given to all spaces. 10. Proper electrical service shall be supplied to all existing RV's, park models, etc., according to the requirements for each respective unit. 11. No expansion of the RV Park shall occur without an amendment to the Special Use Permit.* **Wendell DeCross** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #5 **TENTATIVE PLAT:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Overgaard Springs Ranch L.L.C.** for the approval of Overgaard Springs Ranch, Unit 1 (3.04 Acres), located on APN: 206-27-014F in T12N, R17E, Section 33 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Heber/Overgaard area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton said that the Conceptual Master Plan was approved by the Board of Supervisors and they have submitted the Master Drainage Plan and Traffic Impact Analysis as required by the Board of Supervisors Resolution. The submittal meets all the requirements of the Tentative Plat and staff recommends approval with a stipulation. Mr. Ashton said that engineering comments are that the Tentative Plat appears to meet the requirements of Public works. **Steve Lillie** is the applicant and he was in attendance. Mr. Lillie said that they were burned out by the fire and decided to start fresh with a name change. Mr. Lillie said that they are working diligently on their stipulations addressed by the Development Services Director (Dave Ashton). Mr. Lillie said that one of their major hurdles is the roadway design. Mr. Lillie said that two engineering firms have addressed all the variances. Mr. Lillie refers to the Board of Supervisors Resolution 03-03 indicating that Lee engineering have responded to items 1 through 4 and Murphy Engineering has commented on items 1, 2 and 4. **No one came forward to speak in favor or opposition pertaining to this project.** **John Dalton** asked what is the width of the road. **Richard Young** said that it is 24 feet on the two-way road and they reviewed the applicant's material on the traffic and circulation concerns and expressed his opinion that it has been more than adequately addressed. **Wendell DeCross** expressed concern with the widening of State Highway 260 and said that the second egress is almost a necessity. **Richard Young** said that they did attempt to get a second ingress/egress from the Arizona Department of Transportation and were denied. Mr. Young stated that there is an emergency access through Lot 85 onto Zane Grey to Pine Meadows. **Dave Ashton** showed where they increased the

width to 32 feet from 24 feet. A motion was made by **Wendell DeCross** to approve the Tentative Plat with the one stipulation stated by staff. ***RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS: 1. All engineering design concerns shall be satisfactorily answered prior to scheduling the final plat before the Board of Supervisors.*** **Frank Damato** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

**John Dalton** calls for a 5-minute recess at 8:40 p.m. The commission reconvenes at 8:45 p.m.

Item #6 **TENTATIVE PLAT:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Timberline Development Company, Inc.**, for the approval to amend the Quality Hill Phase II Subdivision, Part of Tract F and Tract A, located on APN: 212-88-053 to 072, T8N, R23E, Section 10 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, in the Pinetop Country Club area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton said that this was approved around in 1986 or 1987 for 20 lots for a condominium. Mr. Ashton said that the developer decided to change from condominiums to town houses. The roads and utilities are already in and they are private and paved. Staff felt this amendment needed to go back to the Planning & Zoning Commission so that the drainage concerns could be addressed. Mr. Ashton said that the Engineering Department said the roads are paved and maintained by the Home Owners Association. Mr. Ashton said that comments from the Flood Control indicate that the preliminary drainage report is acceptable. Tom Hieb Public Works Hydrologist has requested additional details for the improvement plan. Staff recommends approval with the one stipulation. **Ed Mason** is the developer and he was in attendance. Mr. Mason reiterated that he wanted town homes instead of the condominiums because of insurance problems and people wanting to own their own land. Mr. Mason said that it is basically the same unit but a little bit larger. No one came forward to speak in favor or opposition pertaining to this project. **Richard Young** stated that the applicant has provided the radius or the clipped out corners that was requested from their department, and this is something that the applicant would have to clean up in the legal description. Mr. Young said that they needed to make some corrections before the final plat goes through. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to approve the Tentative Plat with the stipulation stated by staff. ***RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS: 1. All engineering design concerns shall be satisfactorily answered prior to scheduling the final plat before the Board of Supervisors.*** **Claire Heywood** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #7 **TENTATIVE PLAT:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by Lakeside 160, L.L.C., for the approval of **Starlight Ridge Estates**, Unit 1 Subdivision, (originally the Kohner Addition) located on APN: 212-05-007E, T9N, R22E, Section 8, of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, in the Wagon Wheel area. **Dave Ashton** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Mr. Ashton said that this is a follow up from the Kohner Addition that was approved in January by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Ashton went on to say that this is the first phase. Mr. Ashton said that the Public Works Department has reviewed their Traffic Impact Analysis, which they have submitted. The Tentative Plat has not been revised but they have added to this in the last week to where they are satisfied that it will work better. The roads will be dedicated to the public. Flood control comments were that this is acceptable for the Tentative Plat submittal and that the Master Drainage Report may need to be revised for the final plat. Staff recommends approval with the one stipulation. **Richard Young** said that this has taken extensive amount of review and the Public Works Department does not see anything that is showstopper. Mr. Young indicated that there would be minor items that they will have to work on prior to the final plat. Mr. Young also said that they have not reviewed the street names with compatibility to their rural addressing system. Mr. Young said that the applicant had submitted a detailed Traffic Impact Analysis and provided the background for the justification of their request for variances. **John Murphy** is speaking in behalf of the developer. Mr. Murphy said that there are 48 individual residential lots and there are two tracts and in accordance with the Master Plan it will be developed as multi-family. Mr. Murphy said that these will be back as individual site plans for their review and approval. Mr. Murphy said that they have complied with the requirements (Master Drainage Plan and Traffic Impact Analysis which was required as a stipulation for a Tentative Plat). Mr. Murphy indicated that they had done a full environment assessment of the property and they had received the final clearance from the Core of Engineers. Mr. Murphy said that the Traffic Impact Analysis does indicate that there will need to be some improvements done to Wagon Wheel Road in the future. Mr. Murphy said that they have started the annexation process with the sanitary district and they will be providing sewer for that area (indicated on the map, area in Wagon Wheel). **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Tom Abend** spoke in opposition to this project. Mr. Abend stated that this was not what we approved in December and sent to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Abend spoke about the road that was not suppose to go through until some time in the future. Mr. Abend said that it was questioned whether it was even going to go through. **Mary Jo Bartlett** presented a question to staff. Ms. Bartlett asked how the Traffic Impact Analysis study was done, when it was done and what were the results. **Richard Young** said that

the Traffic Impact Analysis is in draft form presented to them for review and comment and once it is completed it will be submitted to the White Mountain Regional Transportation Committee for review. Mr. Young said that the draft was dated April 21, 2003. **Judy Abend** spoke in opposition to this request. Ms. Abend referred to P&Z Resolution No. 02-35, stipulation number one (A Traffic Impact Analysis for the development and a Master Drainage Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Engineer's office before the first phase of the Tentative Plat is submitted to the Commission). Ms. Abend questioned the process by asking if we are doing things in order or jumping to the next procedure. **Richard Young** said that Public Works Department had received the Traffic Impact Analysis and have been reviewing it. Mr. Young said that Traffic Impact Analysis is very detailed and their department differs with some of the points that they made on the current levels of service generated by the existing traffic conditions. Mr. Young said that in general the Traffic Impact Analysis does address in detail the conditions that will be generated by the new subdivision and includes a specific recommendation of off site improvements and when they should occur. Mr. Young said that it is not actually approved by the County Engineer's Office, but it has been reviewed and the Public Works Department does not see any major problems that could not be resolved. Mr. Young said as far as the Public Works Department is concerned they have met the intent of the stipulation. **Lance Payette** informed the commission that the issue is whether the applicant has full filled the conditions. Mr. Payette reminded the commission that they have put a stipulation as a requirement and it is up to them if they felt that the condition has been met. A motion was made by Wendell DeCross to Table this item until all the stipulations requirements are met. Claire Heywood seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #8 **Possible approval of March 23, 2003 Minutes.** A motion was made by Frank Damato to approve the minutes. Claire Heywood seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

Item #12 **Commissioners' comments and/or directions to staff. Commissioners may use this time to offer additional comments regarding any item on this agenda or any other topic; and the Commission may direct Development Services Department staff to study or provide additional information on topics of the Commissions' choosing.**

With there being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. Frank Damato made a motion to adjourn. Wendell DeCross seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried. The Commission reserves the right to adjourn into an executive session when needed per 431.03(a)(3) for legal consultation on the above agenda items.

NOTE: a copy of the agenda background material provided to the Commission Members (with exception of material relating to possible executive sessions) is available for public inspection at the Development Services Office, Navajo County Complex, Holbrook, Arizona, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Navajo County  
Planning & Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Navajo County  
Development Services